

Application No. 09/833,965

**REMARKS**

The claims have been amended by adding a recitation that the resin is a polyvinyl butyral resin, and that the fluorinated carbon is selected from specific fluorinated carbons. Entry of the amendments is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3-6 and 9-16 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Hiratsuka, et al. In response, Applicants traverse the rejection.

Hiratsuka, et al. relates to a graphite fluoride synthetic resin composite material. The composite material is taught as being useful as a bearing material. In specific embodiments, the material is used as a self-lubricating bearing material. The reference does not teach or suggest an adhesive material as claimed.

Specifically, the present claims are directed to a seam bonding adhesive. Hiratsuka, et al. does not teach or suggest that the resin contained in the reference can be used as a seam bonding adhesive. Instead, it teaches that the material can be used as a self-lubricating bearing material.

Applicants further submit that one of ordinary skill in the art faced with the teaching of a material for use as a self-lubricating bearing material would not have been motivated to use a modified material as a seam bonding adhesive. In fact, Applicants submit that the teachings of Hiratsuka, et al. are teachings away from the present claims. Specifically, a lubricating material possesses abhesive properties, and not adhesive properties as claimed. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to use a modified material taught for lubrication or abhesive properties as an adhesive to bond a seam together as claimed. Therefore, Applicants submit that the teachings of Hiratsuka, et al. are teachings away from present claims.

In addition, Hiratsuka, et al. does not teach or suggest a polyvinyl butyral resin as claimed. Instead, the reference teaches phenolic resins, vinylic resins, and epoxy resins at the bottom of column 3. The reference does not teach or suggest a polyvinyl butyral resin as claimed.

Moreover, the reference does not teach or suggest the claimed fluorinated carbon.

Application No. 09/833,965

Because the reference does not teach or suggest a seam bonding adhesive, a polyvinyl butyral resin, or the claimed fluorinated carbon, and because the reference teaches away from the claims, Applicants submit that the present claims are not anticipated, nor rendered obvious by the reference

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1, 3-6 and 9-16 under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Hiratsuka, et al.

Claims 7 and 17 have been rejected under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Hiratsuka, et al. In response, Applicants traverse the rejection.

Because claim 7 ultimately depends from claim 1, Applicants repeat the same arguments as to why claim 1 is not rendered obvious in view of the teachings of Hiratsuka, et al.

Claim 17 also includes the recitations of claim 1, although claim 17 is an independent claim. Therefore, Applicants again repeat the above arguments as to why claim 1 is not rendered obvious in view of the cited reference. Applicants further point out that the fluorinated carbon of original claim 17 and now amended claim 1, are not taught or suggested by the reference.

In view of the arguments set forth above in the amendment, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 17 are not rendered obvious in view of the reference, and request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 and 17 under 35 USC §103 as obvious over Hiratsuka, et al.

Claims 1 and 3-17 have been rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Hasegawa, et al or Helland, et al. In response, Applicants traverse the rejection.

Beginning with Hasegawa, et al., this reference teaches a developer composition. A developer is used in the electrostatographic arts along with a toner in order to develop electrostatic latent images. A developer does not have adhesive properties and does not bind seams as set forth in the present claims. Therefore, Hasegawa, et al. does not teach or suggest an adhesive material.

In addition, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to turn to a reference disclosing a developer in order to provide an



Application No. 09/833,965

adhesive as claimed. Developer materials do not have adhesive properties at all. In fact, a developer must have anti-static properties so that the developer and toner do not attach to any of the components in the electrostatographic machine, such as the photoreceptor, transfer, fuser, or pressure member. It is important that the developer only adhere to the paper, which is the final print or copy substrate.

Hasagawa et al. teaches that the toner may include a vinyl butyral resin, but not a polyvinyl butyral resin as claimed. Further, Hasagawa et al. does not teach or suggest the specific fluorinated carbons of amended claim 1. Instead, the reference teaches a degree of fluorination of 100% (column 3, line 42) and at least a value of x in  $(CF_x)_n$  of 0.5 (column 3, line 57). Hasagawa et al. does not teach or suggest fluorinated carbons having the percentage of fluorination as claimed.

Turning to Helland, et al., this reference, as with Hasegawa, et al., teaches developer compositions. Applicants repeat the above arguments as to why the present claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of Hasegawa, et al., because Helland, et al. teaches a developer composition similar to the one disclosed in Hasegawa, et al. Briefly, developers are abhesive materials with anti-static properties, and not adhesive materials. In addition, Helland, et al., does not teach a seam bonding adhesive as claimed.

Further, Helland, et al. teaches a degree of fluorination in the fluorinated carbon of 10 to 100% (Abstract), but does not teach the specific percentages of fluorine in the fluorinated carbons of amended claim 1.

Therefore, because neither reference teaches or suggests the specific fluorinated carbons of amended claim 1, and because neither reference teaches or suggests use of the claimed composition as an adhesive, Applicants submit that the present claims are not obvious in view of the combination cited.

In view of the arguments, Applicants submit that the present claims are not anticipated nor rendered obvious in view of the teachings of Hasegawa, et al. and/or Helland, et al.

Accordingly, Applicants request withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 and 3-17 under 35 USC §102(b) as anticipated by, or, in the alternative, under 35 USC §103(a) as obvious over Hasegawa, et al or Helland, et al.


Application No. 09/833,965

In view of the above arguments and amendments, Applicants submit that all claims should now be in condition for allowance. Early indication of allowability is respectfully requested.

No additional fee is believed to be required for this amendment. However, the undersigned Xerox Corporation attorney (or agent) hereby authorizes the charging of any necessary fees, other than the issue fee, to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025. This also constitutes a request for any needed extension of time and authorization to charge all fees therefor to Xerox Corporation Deposit Account No. 24-0025.

In the event the Examiner considers personal contact advantageous to the disposition of this case, s/he is hereby authorized to call Applicant's Attorney, Annette L. Bade, at telephone number (310) 333-3682.

Respectfully submitted,

  
Annette L. Bade  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 37,029  
(310) 333-3682

ALB/cmu

September 17, 2003  
Xerox Corporation  
1990 Xerox Centre Drive  
El Segundo, CA 90245

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
SEP 22 2003

OFFICIAL